REFLECTIONS

To a Late

BOOK,

Entituled,

The GENUINE REMAINS

OF

Dr. Tho. Barlow,

Late BISHOP of

LINCOLN.

Falsly pretended to be Published from His LORDSHIP'S Original Papers.

With a CATALOGUE of SOCINIAN WRITERS.

Hæc volabam, nescius ne esses. Preface to the *Remains.*

LONDON,
Printed for *Robert Clavell*, at the Peacock in St. *Paul's* Church-Yard. MDCXCIV.

Imprimatur.

Guil. Lancaſter, R. P. D.

Hen. Epiſco. *Lond.* à Sacris Domeſt.

July 25.
1694.

665:101

TO THE

REVEREND DOCTOR *FULLER*,

CHANCELLOR

OF THE

CATHEDRAL CHURCH in *LINCOLN*.

SIR,

AS I shall constantly endeavour to approve my self sensible of my late Lord Bishop of Lincoln's *great Favours in general, so in particular I think my self happy in your Friendship, which I have not a little Experienced ever since my first admission into the Church of* Lincoln, *by vertue of his Lord Bishop's Patronage.*

When I was with you at Lincoln *in* May *last, you were pleased to enquire about the late Bishop of* Lincoln's *Original* MSS, *which were entrusted with my Brother Chaplain and my self; and to express your Concern very much, that such poor Scraps of Learning should be Printed under the Authority of so great a Name as* Doctor Barlow's *was; and that the* Genuine Remains *which were Extant, did not only injure the Memory of him that was a Learned*

Father of our Church, but occaſion'd ſome Perſons to cenſure and condemn thoſe whom he had left his Legatees for his Papers: I did then aſſure you, that we that had the Biſhop's MSS *had taken all imaginable Care of them, having never parted with any of them, nor gave conſent that any part or parcel of them ſhould be Printed; and that what had happen'd was altogether without our knowledge. And thus much I gave you for truth under my own Hand, in a Paper which I left with you; the Subſtance of which I read to the Reverend Doctor* Gardiner, *our preſent Sub-Dean, who was equally concern'd with your ſelf, that any thing ſhould paſs abroad under our late Biſhop's Name and Character, which might in the leaſt prejudice the Church and his Memory. I then ſatisfied you both, that one Sir* P. P. *and the late Vicar of* Bugden, *were the confederate Pedlars, that have endeavour'd to impoſe upon the World ſo much varniſh'd Ware, for the ſake of Twenty Guineas gave for the Copy; as his Wife inform'd a Reverend Friend of mine.*

Soon after I left Lincoln, *I met with the late Miniſter of* Bugden, *who confeſs'd he did communicate the Directions to a young Divine, which uſhers in the reſt of the Remains to Sir* P. P. *which* MSS *I told him was not compleated; for being admitted ſometime to a freedom of Diſcourſe with his Lordſhip,*

Lordſhip, upon my mentioning once the Printing of his Αὐτοσχεδιάσματα, *he was pleas'd to ſay, That he fear'd his Directions were imperfect; for having written them at ſeveral times, they requir'd a careful Review, and more Time than he had then to ſpare for ſuch a purpoſe; but ſaid he hop'd to be more at leiſure to conſult hereafter, what was proper to be done: My Lord in a few Months after died, without peruſing his own Original* MSS. *or Correcting of any Copy, that had been taken after it: And many of thoſe Copies which were wrote from the Original were imperfect; my Lord commanding oftentimes that only ſome part of his Directions ſhould be copied out, which, ſaid he, may be ſufficient for ſome who are very curious in Books, or perhaps not able to buy many.*

At my return hither I delay'd no time to acquaint Mr. Brougham *with the ill Conſequences which I apprehended might enſue, upon our ſuffering ſo much Injuſtice to be done to our late Lord's Memory, without any Advertiſement, or Notice taken of it by us, who were jointly concern'd in our own Vindication, as well as our Lord's: I deſir'd him (ſince he had all the Biſhop's* MSS. *in his cuſtody at* Queens College Oxon.) *to conſult them that were uſeful for our preſent purpoſe, in expoſing the Defects of the* Genuine Remains; *he readily anſwer'd my Re-*

queſt,

queſt, and return'd me the following Letter which I ſend you; and being confident you will be pleas'd with the deſign of doing Juſtice to the Memory of a Learned Prelate, which has ſuffer'd in the Publication of little things, whilſt the more weighty Effects of his indefatigable Pains and Study have (according to his own Inclinations and Will) been kept from being made Publick.

I am Sir,

Middleton-Stony,
Jun. 23. 94.

Your moſt Obliged Servant,

William Offley.

REFLE

REFLECTIONS

On a Late

BOOK, &c.

SIR,

YOU may remember, that diſcourſing with you frequently about ſome Pieces that have appear'd under the late Learned and Pious Biſhop of *Lincoln*'s Name, particularly that of the *Genuine Remains*, I always expreſs't my Senſe about them to this effect; That though there was foul play practiſed in the publiſhing of them, and ſuch as deſerved to be taken notice of, yet that thoſe concern'd therein had laid their deſign (of getting a penny) ſo open, and their poor Arts of raiſing the price and bulk of a Book ſo obvious and undiſguiſed, that they were viſible to every Eye without being pointed to, and ſo needed not be more effectually expoſed than they had done it themſelves.

And for the clearing us, whom the Biſhop was pleaſed to appoint Legatees for all his own Original Manuſcripts, I thought it ſufficient for us openly to diſavow (as for my part, I did upon all occaſions) our being either conſenting or ſo much as privy to the Printing any of them; which if we had been minded to do, it had

had been eaſy to have made choice of ſuch, as were infinitely more worthy of the Biſhop's Character. And to remove all Suſpicion at the greater diſtance, I fail'd not to acquaint others (as opportunity ſerved) that the Biſhop, at the diſpoſal of his MSS. ſhew'd no inclination to have any of them publiſh'd after his Deceaſe; for that the freedom being taken to ask his Lordſhip whether he would have any of them Printed, his Anſwer was, (as near as I could recollect) that he did not deſire that any ſhould. Now though this did not amount to an abſolute Prohibition, yet I told them we took it to be a Signification of the Biſhop's Mind, and accordingly thought our Selves bound religiouſly to obſerve it, notwithſtanding the expectations and importunities of others, or the Advantage we might otherwiſe propoſe to our ſelves.

And thus being in no wiſe conſcious to our ſelves, of ſending any thing abroad under the Biſhop's Name; I hope it may ſeem the more excuſable that we have been the leſs concern'd to publiſh our Innocence.

The only thing then that could be expected from us, was, thas ſomething ſhould be offer'd in Vindication of the Biſhop's Memory, to which upon ſeveral accounts we owe a great Eſteem and Veneration, and which indeed would be extremely injured, if the World ſhould believe (what is ſuggeſted in the Pompous Title) that Thoſe were THE *Genuine* Products of the Learned Prelate's long Study and Labour. But the truth is, I could never perſwade my ſelf that any that were acquainted with his Lordſhip's great Abilities (as few were ignorant of them) could ever entertain ſo injurious a thought of him. It was very well known that as He had made a noble Collection of Books, ſo he put them to better uſe than any thing that's Printed

ſince

ſince his Death doth ſhew; and has taken the moſt effectual way to make them ſerviceable hereafter, by bequeathing them to *Bodley*'s and Queens-*College* Libraries in *Oxford*, and thereby accompliſhing his own often repeated promiſes, and the hopes that others had conceiv'd thereupon.

And theſe Conſiderations you know, Sir, wrought ſo far with me, that I thought it unneceſſary any thing ſhould be offer'd in print, either for the Vindication of our Patron, or the Satisfaction of others. And herein you ſeem'd heretofore to concur with me. Nevertheleſs, ſince as well upon the ſaid accounts, as to juſtify our ſelves from ſome groundleſs ſurmiſes, you judge it needful ſomething ſhould be ſaid; I am ready to communicate a few things that occur'd to me in the peruſal of the *Remains* (for to take notice of every thing that would bear a Reflection, would be an endleſs labour) and ſhall leave it to your Diſcretion to make what uſe of them you think fit.

It was not to be expected, but that one ſpecious Pretence or other would be made uſe of to palliate the matter, and the rather, becauſe the moſt unbecoming Actions (like the homelieſt Faces) require the moſt Art to ſet them off. And therefore to make Bookſeller and Buyer the better to ſwallow the Pill, nothing leſs is pretended than the gratifyng the Learned *World*, and *erecting a laſting Monument of Praiſe to the Biſhop's Memory, by the Publication of this Book.* As to the latter part of the Plea, it muſt be owned that the Pious Architect's Zeal for the Biſhop's Honour has tranſported him ſo far, that rather than want Materials for a Monument, he has piled together ſuch deſpicable ones, as if compar'd with others the Biſhop has left behind Him, would make Him lamented as buried in Ruins.

How far he deſign'd to oblige the World by this Collection of Relicks, is only diſcernible to the Searcher of Hearts; but how far he has compaſs'd that Deſign, others may judge: And I can't forbear (on this Occaſion) reflecting on the ſubtile Trade which the Romiſh Fryars drive in vending the *Relicks* of their *Saints*, which, there are ſhrew'd Temptations to believe, is not ſo much for the benefit of the People as themſelves.

But that which ſeems a *Jeſt* upon the Reader's Underſtanding, is, that the Editor would make him believe he is tender of (*a*) *ſwelling the Volume to too great* a bulk, when 'tis viſible he has ſcraped together both Old and New, Good and Bad, Genuine and Adulterate, the one to be a Vehicle to the other, and both together to ſcrew Mr. *Dunton* up to a Pitch. If the World be ſo Superſtitious as to be fond of Relicks, does he think Men will renounce their Senſes too, and in ſpight of them believe that he is in good earneſt careful not to be too bulky, when to advance the number of Sheets he has added ſeveral of his own, and patch'd up a third part of the reſt of the Book out of old Pieces, witneſs the Preface to the Gun-powder Treaſon, the Tract againſt *Baxter*, and the two Metaphyſical Exercitations; when he has glean'd up a parcel of private Letters and Correſpondencies, and much other crude and indigeſted Matter, which we may reaſonably preſume the Biſhop would never have deſired ſhould have ſeen any other light after his death, but that of the Flames?

(*a*) p. 567.

In the Directions to a Young Divine, there are abundance of things marſhall'd under that Head, which the Biſhop never intended for that purpoſe. Amongſt others, there's a Syllabus of Socinian Queſtions foiſted in; concerning which 'twould perhaps puzzle the Editor to

give

give a ſatisfactory Anſwer to any of theſe Four Queſtions. *Why it was Printed at all? Why at ſuch an unſeaſonable time? Why under a falſe and improper Head? And why ſo lame and imperfect?*

Why Printed at all? Was it that the Editor would have the Biſhop thought an Abettor of Socinianiſm? from which he ſtood at as great a Diſtance, as one part of a Contradiction from the other, as every one knows that was not a meer Stranger both to his Writings and Converſation. Or was it for the general Information of Mankind, in a part of knowledge they might with more ſafety be ignorant of? The Socinians are look'd upon by ſome as great Maſters of reaſoning, and perhaps they bid as fair for it, as the weakneſs of the Cauſe, they maintain, will admit of: So that what *M. Cato* obſerv'd of *Cæſar*, ſeems in ſome wiſe applicable to *Socinus*, *Unum ex Omnibus ad Evertendam Rempublicam* [*Chriſtianam*] *Sobrium acceſſiſſe.* And his Opinions being ſo dangerous to the Foundation of Chriſtianity, it is ſomewhat unaccountable what neceſſity there was, to be directed to Chapter, Page, and Section, where to find them aſſerted to all the advantage they are capable of: Eſpecially if we conſider, that Men are *naturally* too inquiſitive after *forbidden* Knowledge: The Experiment coſt our firſt Parents very dear, and their Poſterity have ever had ſuch a fatal Curioſity to pry into the Errors of former Ages, as never needs to be ſet on edge. Whatſoever therefore the Biſhop might Communicate to *a particular Friend, and one that was more than ordinarily curious in the Study of Theological Matters* (as the Prefacer has it) yet he could never intend that Syllabus of Queſtions (in the dreſs it appears in) for common and Publick Uſe: Much leſs would he ever have conſented to the diſperſing of it

at

at ſuch a time as this, when the Peſtilent Hereſies of *Socinus* are more induſtriouſly propagated in the Nation than ever.

But there is yet more Injuſtice done the Biſhop, by Printing it under an improper Head. 'Tis certain he never made *That* any part of his Inſtructions to a young Divine, either in that Copy the Editor met with or any other. For the Learned Prelate could not be ignorant, how dangerous it might prove to a *Novice* in Divinity, to direct him to a number of Socinian Writers, without Signifying withal where to find their Errors confuted. This had been to preſcribe *Poiſon* without it's *Antidote*; to pervert and lead aſtray his young Student, rather than inſtruct him in the right Search of Truth, and ſo to influence his more injudicious years with the leaven of Hereſie, as it might coſt him ſome time and pains to wear off the Impreſſion.

But laſtly, if printed it *muſt* be, and at an *unſeaſonable* time too, and moreover under an *improper Head*; why was it after all ſent abroad ſo *lame* and *imperfect*, *I mean*, without thoſe references to Orthodox Authors, who have deſignedly and ſucceſsfully writ againſt the Socinians, and which are found in the Biſhop's Original Papers? I am not willing indeed to believe that the Collector omitted them out of any affection to Socinianiſm. No, to do him right, he is ſo true to his main end, and has ſo carefully inſerted (without Diſtinction) whatever might ſerve to promote it, that he can't be ſuſpected to poſtpone his Intereſt in favour of that, or any other Perſwaſion whatſoever. And therefore we may well enough ſuppoſe he has left out nothing that was in the Copy he met with: But then, is there not reaſon to expoſtulate the

Caſe

Caſe with him, why this or any thing elſe ſhould be publiſh'd under a great Name from Copies defective or unfiniſh'd, to the Impairing of the Author's Reputation, and rather injury than benefit of others? But to make no more words about it, to ſhew how Genuine a Remain this ſame (amongſt others) is, I have ſent you what I find in the Biſhop's MSS concerning the Anti-Socinian Writers, which I ſhould think, ought rather to have been Printed ſingle, and the other omitted, than the contrary.

What follows the *Directions* (to Page 383.) is little elſe but ſome private Letters and ſcatter'd Papers, glean'd up from ſeveral Quarters; many of which are not to be found amongſt the Biſhop's Writings; a certain ſign this, that if they be Genuine, he ſet little or no value on them; it being his conſtant Method, when he communicated any thing he valued, to his Friends, to deſire them to return the Copy, or at leaſt to cauſe it to be tranſcribed before he ſent it. Amongſt his Papers there are found Letters writ from every Corner of the Compaſs, and amongſt others, ſome ſign'd with *P. P.* and dated from the *Strand*, near the *May-pole*. If all were ſuch as His, it would be worth the while to make a Preſent of them to the Haberdaſher of Smallwares in the *Poultrey*. But I would firſt know whether *P. P.* would take it well to have His Expos'd to publick Cenſure. The *Prefacer* to the *Remains*, (if that be his Name at large) ſays that no Works are more grateful to Critical Readers, than ſuch as are comprized by way of Epiſtle. Now I do aſſure him, His are very entertaining that way; and if we ſhould divert the Reader at his coſt, it would be but a juſt Retaliation. However, his Letters will be kept by way of Reprizal for further Service.

Next in order follow a Preface to a Diſcourſe concerning the *Gunpowder-Treaſon*, an Anſwer to a Tract of Mr. *Baxter*'s, and a little after two Metaphyſical Exercitations; all which being in Print before, 'tis hard to ſay for what end they are now Re-printed, unleſs to ſwell the Volume, and thereby lay a Tax upon the Subject. I believe few will think the Tranſlator of the Exercitations has merited any thing by his pains, either from the Biſhop or the Reader. For of good Latine States, he has made them but very indifferent *Engliſh* ones, and as unintelligible to the *Engliſh* Reader, (for whom, I ſuppoſe, they were deſign'd) as Roſacruſian Philoſophy.

The like, nay much worſe Treatment have the *States* of Queſtions met with, which begin *p.* 568. and ſo in a manner cloſe the Book. Theſe they have given us in ſuch an Heterogeneous, Equivocal Mungrel Verſion, as I defy the whole Fraternity of Tranſlators to match, from the famous *R. L.* down to *M*'s. School-boys. So that it may truly be vouched upon this occaſion, if ever, *Faciunt intelligendo ut nihil intelligant.* Beſides 'tis manifeſt, the Biſhop has writ them haſtily and incuriouſly; And though probably he might ſometimes read them in the College Chappel, yet it can no more from thence be concluded, that he calculated them for the Preſs, than that a Man deſigns every thing he utters amongſt private Friends ſhould be proclaim'd at the Croſs. But whatſoever they are in themſelves, they have ſuffer'd in many places, by being garbled, depraved and ill Tranſlated, and ſometimes by the omiſſion of (what was of great Uſe in ſuch ſhort and imperfect Tracts) the References to particular Authors, who have handled the Points more copiouſly.

That

That this Charge may not ſeem to be laid without Ground, I will give you a few Specimens of the Tranſlator's or Tranſcriber's Performance in one of the States. And to prevent all Suſpicion, as if I intended to aggravate the matter, and with a ſpiteful Diligence to cull out the worſt for a Pattern of the reſt, I will be ſo fair as to look no farther than into the very firſt Queſtion that offers it ſelf, and from thence leave others to judge what may be expected in the reſt.

The firſt Queſtion then is, * *An Præſcientia Divina à Rebus prævisis tollat Contingentiam?* where we need not ſeek far before the Tranſlator gives us ſome Tryals of his Skill. For in the very firſt Page but one, and within the compaſs of half of it, there are half as many Blunders as Lines. Inſtead of *Alicui præſens eſſe, (lin.* 14.*)* as it is in the Original, and as the Author's Senſe requires it ſhould be, we read corruptly, *Alicujus præſens eſſe.* The Biſhop is proving that a Future Contingent, cannot be actually Preſent (*Scientiæ etiam Divinæ*) even to Divine Knowledge; and gives this Reaſon for it, becauſe *Alicui præſens eſſe ſupponit eſſe ex parte rei,* To be preſent to any one, *&c.* not *alicujus*, but *alicui* in the ſame Caſe with *Scientia Divina.* This, 'tis true, may be a ſlip of the Preſs, but it looks much liker an Error elſewhere. * p. 568.

Two or three Lines further the Biſhop adds, *Cum ideo Deus præſcivit Futura Contingentia ab æterno, neceſſe eſt ut ipſi etiam ſint futura, nempe reſpectu actualis exiſtentiæ.* This is render'd, When therefore God did foreknow future Contingencies from Eternity, it is neceſſary that they ſhould be to him even Future. Now any School-boy would have render'd [*Cum ideo*] properly [*Since therefore*]; and *neceſſe eſt ut ipſi etiam ſint futura,* ſhould likewiſe have been turn'd, *It is neceſſary*

that

that they be future even to him, or to him alſo, not *to him even future*; becauſe, 'tis plain, *Etiam* makes *Ipſi* Emphatical, not *Futura*; agreeably to the Biſhop's deſign, which was to prove that Future Contingents are future *even to God*, is, to him as well as to others; that which ſome, whom he mentions, did deny.

But the next words that follow are perverted more inexcuſably. The words in the MS. are, *Futura Contingentia ab æterno non erant*, which the unskilful Garbler has turn'd, *They were not futura contingentia ab æterno*; which neither anſwers the Biſhop's Latin, nor his Argument, nor makes him write conſiſtently with Truth, or with himſelf. It anſwers not his Latin; For theſe words *Futura contingentia ab æterno non erant*, are a Propoſition *ſecundi Adjacentis* (as the Logicians term it) wherein the *Verb* includes both the *Copula* and the *Predicate*; and ſo *non erant* ſignifies as much as *non exiſtebant*, or *non erant exiſtentia:* and the Senſe of the words will be, that *Future Contingents were not exiſtent from all Eternity.* This will appear plain enough, if we conſider the Argument. For the Biſhop's Aſſertion immediately preceding is, that Future Contingents could not be preſent with God from Eternity, in reſpect of their actual Exiſtence; the medium whereby he proves it expreſly, is, becauſe Future Contingents *ab æterno non erant*, were not exiſtent from Eternity, therefore he infers from Eternity they could not be preſent with God. Thus it appears the Tranſlator has neither underſtood the Senſe of the Biſhop's words, nor the drift of his Argument: and yet both theſe are more pardonable, than to make him aſſert that which is really falſe in it ſelf, and moreover a Contradiction to what he had ſaid juſt before. It is falſe to ſay, They were not *futura Contingentia ab Æterno*; for future

ture Contingents were ſuch from Eternity; the matter of this Propoſition, for Inſtance, *Petrus Dominum abnegabit*, being future and contingent from Eternity. And if they were not from Eternity, then they could not be fore-known by God from Eternity; but the Biſhop had ſaid in the words foregoing, that God fore-knew them from Eternity: Therefore to make Him aſſert that Future Contingents were not from Eternity, is to make him inconſiſtent with himſelf: For which all due Thanks to the Tranſlator's Care and Judgment.

If any of the forementiond Miſtakes ſeem too light to be animadverted upon; yet Miſtakes they are, and ſuch as none that had rightly underſtood what he had been about, could have been guilty of. And ſtumbling upon ſo many within ſo ſhort a compaſs, and at the very Threſhold (as it were), I thought I needed go no further in; looking upon theſe as an Omen, or ſufficient warning what we have to truſt to elſewhere.

But beſides the unfaithfulneſs of the Verſion-part either the Tranſcriber of the States (whom the Editor ſpeaks of p. 567.) took but imperfect Copies of them, or the Tranſlator has aſſum'd (by what authority, I know not) an Inquiſitorial Power of Purgation, or rather Depravation, through the whole. And of this alſo (according to promiſe) I will ſeek for no other proof, but what the firſt Queſtion furniſhes us with.

The Biſhop, it ſeems, reſolves it into theſe two Concluſions:

1. *Quod Deus Futura Contingentia cognoſcat.*
2. *Quod cognitio hæc eorum contingentiam non tollat.*

The former (*viz.*) That God do's foreknow future Contingents, he proves, againſt the Socinians, by three

Arguments; the firſt of which is taken from God's Foreknowledge and Prediction of the Circumſtances of our Saviour's Conception and Birth. This the Purgator has vouchſafed to tranſmit more faithfully than the other, though not entirely neither. But for the other two, he has ſo contracted them into Short-hand, that they are rather Hints than Arguments, as is eaſily perceiv'd by comparing the Arguments as managed by the Biſhop, and as dock'd and mangled in the Remains.

The Biſhop's Second Argument ſtands thus:

2. Joh. 19. v. 36. *Chriſto de arbore infelici Suſpenſo, unà cum Sicariis, accedunt Milites; reliquorum crura frangunt, ſed Chriſti crura integra relinquunt & illæſa: Rationem reddit Textus, Omnia hæc geſta ſunt, ut Scriptura impleretur, dicens,* Non frangetur ejus os unum. *Cum ideo hoc Deus prædixit, cumq; contingens omnino erat, (Milites enim potentiam habuerunt liberam, ut frangerent, & Chriſti crura talia erant, ut facilè frangi poterant) manifeſtum eſt Futura contingentia Deo eſſe certò cognita. Dico, Certò cognovit Deus crura non eſſe frangenda, alias falli poterat, quod tamen Sacer Textus expreſſè negat.* Joh. 10. 35. Si illos dixit Deos, ad quos Sermo Dei factus eſt, & Scriptura ſolvi non poteſt, *&c. Scil. ſi Chriſto fides, Scriptura* ὐ δύναται λυθῆναι, *non poteſt ſolvi*, i. e. *violari aut irrita reddi*; ὐ δύναται λυθῆναι, *non poſſibile eſt, ſeu (quod idem) impoſſibile eſt ut ſolvatur: Et ideo neceſſe eſt ut Futura Contingentia ita eveniant prout prædixit Deus.*

Here is ſome Management of an Argument in this; but one muſt have very good Eyes, or elſe the Tranſlator's Spectacles, that can diſcern the true ſtreſs of it, as he has order'd it; which take as follows, at *Large.*

And

And then it was foretold, that not a Bone of Chriſt ſhould be broken on the Croſs, and many Circumſtances were verified according to the Propheſies of old therein.

The ſame Fate has the Biſhop's Third Argument undergon, which in the MS. runs thus,

3. *Deus hoc ſibi arrogat ut incommunicabile Deitatis privilegium, quod futura prænuntiet.* Iſa. 41. 22, 23. *Sic enim Deus falſos alloquitur Prophetas*---Annuntiate futura, *ut* cognoſcamus, quia Dii eſtis. *Sic Iſa.* 44. 6, 7. Præter me non eſt Deus: quis mihi ſimilis? Vocet & denuntiet, ex quo conſtitui populum antiquum; ventura & futura annuntient iis. *Sic Dan.* 2. Myſterium, quod Rex interrogat, Sapientes, Magi, Arioli & Aruſpices nequeunt indicare Regi; ſed eſt Deus in Cœlo revelans myſteria, qui indicabit Tibi, O Rex, quæ ventura ſunt in noviſſimis temporibus. *Nempe futura in noviſſimis temporibus revelat Deus, eaq; contingentia: nam (1°.) Futura neceſſaria non ſolum Dæmones, ſed & homines ſapientes revelare poterant; at futura, de quibus ſacer Textus hic loquitur, Deus ſibi-ipſi ſoli arrogat revelanda (2°.) Futura de quibus hic loquitur* Daniel, *erant de regno Chriſti Sub Evangelio, de regno Babylonico, Perſico, Macedonico, Romano; futura ſcil. per homines liberrimè adminiſtrata. At hæc omnia certò & infallibiliter prædixit Deus. Ergo, Futura contingentia certò cognoſcit.*

Of all this the Epitomizer vouchſafes to give us only a ſhort hint in theſe words:

This Fore-knowledge in Scripture God aſſumes to Himſelf, and *upbraids the Falſe Prophets, becauſe they did not know things to come,* Iſa. 44. Dan. 2.

The Biſhop having ſaid all he thought neceſſary upon the firſt Poſition above-mention'd, *viz. That God fore-knows future Contingents,* he refers his Hearers for further

further Information to ſeveral * Authors, who handle it more largely; whom the Purgator has very judiciouſly paſs'd over, though one would think ſuch References were of moſt Uſe in Abſtracts, or ſhort States.

You ſee I have run through the Book, but after a Deſultory manner: Yet theſe Evidences (out of many that might be produced) are ſufficient to ſhew what an unlimited and an unwarrantable Liberty is taken, not only to publiſh things without the Author's Conſent, either expreſs or preſumptive, but alſo to maim, corrupt and abuſe them, and after all to Palm them for Genuine upon the World.

I would here make an end, but that the Editor has contrived ſuch a *Remain* for the cloſe of his Book, as deſerves not to be paſs'd over without an Obſervation. 'Tis a Letter of the Biſhop's to his *Clergy*, *occaſion'd by an Order of Seſſions, for the Proſecution of the Laws againſt Diſſenters*, which whatever Service or Credit it may do the Biſhop, I am ſure can do the Editor neither. For 'tis notorious that Sir *P. P.* has been a Champion for Toleration; witneſs the Caſe of Toleration heretofore Printed with his Name to it, and his Preface to a former Book of the Biſhop of *Lincoln*'s Tracts: And yet he has taken care to let the World underſtand by this Letter, that the Biſhop thought the Laws againſt Diſſenters good, and their Execution neceſſary, and that he not only requir'd his Clergy to publiſh the above-ſaid Order, and diligently to advance the deſign of it, but inforc'd the Reaſonableneſs of Conformity to the Eſtabliſht Church by ſuch Arguments, as in my opinion, 'tis ſcarce poſſible to compriſe more or weightier in ſo ſmall a compaſs. The Letter is but of two Pages, and if you have read it, pray tell me whether the Bp. has not ſaid as much as

* *Qui plura vellet, Aquin. videat P. 1. qu. 14. Magiſtr. Sentent. l. 1. qu. 38. Et Commentatores ibi paſſim omnes, præcipuè Franciſc. Cumel, Variar. Diſput. in primam partem Aquin. ubi per totam de Præſcientia Dei circa Fut. Conting. fusè diſputat & nervosè, &c.*

as could well be ſaid, in ſo few lines, & what your thoughts were upon reading of it. Was it not obvious to conceive, that Conſidering Men would begin to queſtion, whether the Diſcourſe for Toleration, Printed amongſt others lately under the Bp's Name, were really the Bp's, or ſome *Suppoſititious* Piece? (And then let *Sir P.* ſee how he will avoid the ſuſpicion of Forgery). Or if they acquit *Sir P.* in that, they would at leaſt perceive, that how reaſonable ſoever in the *Theory* a Toleration might ſeem to the Bp. yet when he came to reduce it to *Practice*, and have to do with the troubleſome *Spirit* of our *Diſſenters*, he found it not feaſible, nor conſiſtent with the Weal of the Church: And then let *Sir P.* (the Champion for Toleration,) ſee how he will juſtify the Publiſhing ſo much againſt a Toleration, and under a Government too, that he would fain flatter for having granted it, and Eſtabliſht it by Law.

I fear I have tranſgreſs'd the bounds of a Letter; therefore I ſhall add no more, ſave only to put in a ſhort Caveat or two. And in the firſt place, *Caveat Emptor*, let the Purchaſer beware hereafter, how he is impos'd upon by *Surreptitious* Pieces. All Coins have not the true *Stamp*; and ſome that have, have too great a mixture of the Alloy in the Metal to paſs currant.

And if I might be admitted for once to be of Counſel to Perſons of Quality and Learning, I would humbly adviſe them to be very cautious whom they admit *à Secretis*, leſt it be their lot (as it has been lately of a *Spiritual* and a Temporal * Lord) to have their Privacies expos'd by ſome Relick-Monger or other. I am

* *Vid. Sir* Joh. Thompſon's *Vindication of the* E. *of* A.

Your affectionate Friend
and Servant,

Queen's-College,
June 20. 1694.

Hen. Brougham.

What relates to the Socinian *Controverſie, and is found in the* Biſhop's *MS. but omitted in the* Remains, *is as follows:*

An Myſteria Fidei à ratione naturali apprehendi poſſunt?

Negant:

1. LUbbertus de Chriſto Servatore. *l.* 4. *cap.* 12. *pag.* 582.
2. Jac. ad Portum Orthodoxâ fidei defenſione. *cap.* 30. *pag.* 377.
3. Ludovicus Crocius in Anti-Socinianiſmo. *Diſp.* 7. *pag.* 64.
4. Andreas Prolæus in Matæologiâ ſua Sociniana. *c.* 2. *p.* 21, 22. *&c.*
5. Chriſtianus Dithmarſus in Coll. Exercitationum Anti-Socinianarum. *Exercit.* 2. *p.* 32. *&c.*
6. Balth. Meiſnerus Conſiderat. Theologiæ Photinianæ. *cap.* 4. *pag.* 310.
7. Joh. Hoornebeck Socinianiſmi Confutati, *Tom.* 1. *l.* 1. *c.* 5. *fusè.*
8. Sam. Mareſius in Hydrâ Socinianiſmi confutatâ. *l.* 1. *c.* 25. *p.* 392.
9. Suarez Opuſc. *lib.* 3. *cap.* 1°, 2°.
10. Pet. Lombard. Sent. *Lib.* 2. *Diſp.* 26. Vid. Commentatores, *ibid.*
11. Aquinas. 22. *Quæſt.* 2. *Art.* 3. 4. *&* Commentatores, *ibid.*

An

An Sociniani ſint verè Chriſtiani?

Negant.

1. LUdov. Crocius Anti-Socinianiſmi. *Diſſ.* 1. §. 4.
2. Andræas Prolæus in Matæol. Sociniană. *c.* 1. *qu.* 5. *l.* 7. *&c.*
3. Balthaſ. Meiſnerus in brevi Conſid. Theologiæ Photinianæ. *c.* 4. *pag.* 294. *& c.* 5. *pag.* 634.
4. Jacob. Martinus. Synopſi Religionis Photinianæ *cap.* 6. §. 26. *pag.* 144. *& c.* 1. §. 14.
5. Joh. Polyander Concertat. Anti-Socinianâ. 1ª. *Diſſ.* 4, 5.
6. Joh. Hoornebeck Socinianiſmi Confut. *Tom.* 1. *l.* 2. *c.* 9. *pag.* 188.

Authores aliqui qui contra F. Socinum Senenſem, ſuiq; ſequaces ſcripſerunt.

1. JAcobus ad Portum, *SS.* Theologiæ in Acad. Lauſannenſi Profeſſor, ſcripſit *Defenſionem Fidei Orthodoxæ* adverſus *Chriſtophori Oſtorodii Inſtitutiones Religionis Chriſtianæ*, Genev. Edit. An. 1613. 4to.
2. Sibrandus Lubbertus ſcripſit contra F. Socinum, lib. 4. *de Jeſu Chriſto Servatore.* 4to.
3. Andreas Eſſenius ὑπαθηνὸς, Hug. Grotii ſcripſit Lib. cui Titulus—*Triumphus Crucis, ſeu Fides Catholica de Satisfactione Chriſti contra* Joh. *Crellium Fran.* 4to.
4. Johan. Henr. Biſterfeldius Naſſovius ſcripſit de *Uno Deo, Patre, Filio, & Spiritu Sancto, contra* Joh. *Crellii*, l. 2. *de Uno Deo Patre.* Lug. Bat. 1639. 4to.
5. Wolfangus Franzius ſcripſit Diſp. *varias adverſus Photinianos pro Satisfactione Chriſti*, Sub hoc Titulo, *Diſputationes Theolog. de Sacrificiis Satisfactionis Chriſti pro peccatis totius Mundi præſtitæ.* Typis Firmiſſimis. 4to.

6. Chri-

6. Chriſtanus Matthias Dithmarſus in Academiâ Noricorum Altorfinâ Profeſſor, ſcripſit & edidit *Collegium Exercitationum Theologicarum Anti-Photinianum, in quo Diſputationes decem.* (1.) De Notitiæ Dei naturalis exiſtentia & eſſentiâ. (2.) De Notitiæ naturalis uſu & efficaciâ. (3.) De Θεονομία, i. e. Nomenclaturâ Divinâ in genere & in ſpecie de nomine *Jehova.* (4.) De appellatione *Deus.* (5.) De appellatione *Adon*, Κύριος, *Dominus.* (6.) De Dei definitione, genere & Prædicatorum qualitate. (7.) De Eſſentiæ Divinæ unitate. (8.) De naturâ Attributorum Divinorum ad *intra* conſideratorum. (9.) De Attributis Divinis *ad extra.* (10.) De ordine Attributorum Divinorum. 4to.

7. Valentinus Legdæus Suerinenſis edidit *Examen refutationis Valent. Smalcii, quam Theſibus Alberti Graweri de Æternâ Deitate & Incarnatione Filii Dei,* oppoſuit. 4to.

8. Joh. Winterus Naumbergenſis edidit *refutationem Sententiæ F. Socini* de Juſtificatione hominis coram Deo, quam tractat in prælectionibus Theolog. *cap.* 15. Problemata Socini quinq; ponit & refellit. 4to.

1. An in Juſtificatione noſtrâ peccata noſtra deleantur nudâ remiſſione, ſine Satisfactione? Aſſerit Socinus.
2. An Deus poterat peccata condonare ſine Satisfactione? Aſſerit Socinus.
3. An Vitæ innocentia poſſit cenſeri loco Satisfactionis, & articulum Juſtificationis ingredi? Aſſerit Socinus.
4. An Deus voluerit peccata ſine ſatisfactione condonare? Aſſerit Socinus.
5. An Chriſtus pro peccatis noſtris ſatisfecerit? Negat Socinus. Idem ſcripſit *Collationem & Differentiam Vet. & Nov.* Teſtamenti *Sacerdotum:* Item Tractatum de hac quæſtione, An *Adamus in ſtatu Integritatis fuerit Mortalis?* Aſſerit Socinus. Negat Winterus.

9. Joh. Junius Eccleſiæ Sylvæ Ducenſis Paſtor ſcripſit *Refutationem Prælectionum Theologicarum* F. Socini Senenſis, Amſtelod. 1633. 8vo.

10. Bal-

10. Balthazar Meiſnerus in Academiâ Wittebergenſi Profeſſor ſcripſit Lib. cui Tit. *Brevis Conſideratio Theologiæ Photinianæ, prout eam F. Socinus deſcripſit* libello cui titulus—— *Quod Evangelici omnino debent ſe illorum cætui adjungere, qui falsò Ariani & Ebionitæ vocantur.* 8vo.

11. Jacob. Martin. ſcripſit Lib. cui tit——*Synopſis totius Religionis Photinianæ ex illorum Inſtitutione brevi, Volkelio, Oſtorodo, aliiſq; ejus ſectæ authoribus repetitæ & breviter refutatæ.* 8vo.

12. Johan. Junius Eccleſia Aſſendelphenſis Miniſter ſcripſit *Examen Reſponſionis F. Socini ad Librum Jacobi Wieki, de Divinitate Filii Dei, & Spiritus Sancti.* Amſtelod. An. 1628. 8vo.

13. Johan. Polyander Profeſſor Leidenſis ſcripſit Lib. cui Tit. *Prima concertatio Anti-Sociniana Diſputationibus* 48. *comprehenſa.* Amſtel. An. 1640. 8vo.

14. Joh. Paulus Fetwinger in Acad. Altdorphinâ Alumnorum Noricorum Ephorus ſcripſit Lib. cui Titulus——*Vindiciæ Incarnationis Jeſu Chriſti æterni Patris æterni Filii,* pro Alberto Grawero Profeſſore olim Jenenſi. 8vo.

15. Andreas * Keſlerus Superintendens Eisfeldenſis ſcripſit Lib. cui Tit. *Phyſicæ Photinianæ Examen,* &c. An. 1630. 8vo.

* *Idem* Keſleruſhabet *Logicæ & Metaphyſicæ Sociniana Examen.*

16. Jacob. Martin. ſcripſit Lib. cui Tit. *J. Martini de tribus Elohim Liber primus, Photinianorum novorum, præcipuè Georg. Emeldeni blaſphemiis oppoſitus.* An. 1619. Octavo.

17. Andreas Volanus ſcripſit Lib. cui tit. *Paræneſis Ard. Volani ad omnes in regno Poloniæ, magno Ducatu Lithuaniæ, Somoſateníanæ Doctrinæ Profeſſores: & ad nova Ebionitarum contra Paræneſin objecta reſpontio.* Spiræ. An. 1582.

18. Prodiit not ita pridem Libellus cui titulus, *Specimen refutationis libri Johanis Crellii de Satisfactione Christi.* Authore L. V. *&c.* Trajecti ad Rhenum. An. 1648. 12mo.

19. Extat Meditatio Theologica *de usu* * *& abusu rationis Humanæ in interpretandis & æstimandis rebus & Scripturis Divinis.* per C.S.A. Lug. Batav. 1633. 12mo.

* *Vide sis hac de re Joach. Stegman. de Judice & norma Fidei Controversiarum Libros duos. Eleutheropoli. An.* 1644.

20. Ambrosius de Penalosa scripsit Opus egregium de *Christi & Spiritus Sancti Divinitate, & Trinitatis Mysterio* contra Socinianos. An. 1635. Fol.

21. Nicolaus Arnoldus Polonus Ecclesiæ Beetkumanæ Minister librum edidit cui Tit. *Johan. Maccovius Redivivus,* continens. 1. πρῶτον ψεῦδος Pontificiorum Socinianorum, *&c.* 2. Casus Conscientiæ ad normam Doctrinæ Socinianæ. 3. Anti-Socinum, cum Appendice de Atheis. An. 1647. 4to.

22. Hugo Grotius de *Satisfactione Christi contra, F. Socinum* || cui resp. Andreas Essenuis in *Triumpho Crucis,* & L. V. in *Specimine refutationis Joh. Crellii de Satisfactione Christi.* 8vo.

|| i.e. *Socino.*

23. Vid. Ludov. Lucium *de Satisfactione Christi* contra Michaelem Gettichium. *Edit. Basil.* 1612. 8vo.

24. Lambert. Danæus in P. Lomb. Sentent. lib. 1. multa pro Trinitate disputat. Edit An. 1580. 8vo.

25. Christianus Becmannus Bornensis edidit *Exercitationes Theolog. pro Deitate Christi, &c.* contra Socinum, Smalcium, Ostorodum, Crellium, Mennonem Simonis, Paracelsum, Wiegelium, *&c. Amst. An.* 1643. Fol.

26. Joh. Paulus Felwingern scripsit *Examen disquisitionis brevis edit.* Norembergæ. 1637. 8vo.

27. Sam. Maresii *Xenia Academica, seu de Divinitate & Personalitate Sp. Sancti* contra Socinianos (cum aliis) 4to.

28. Disputatio Theologica Orthodoxa de *Sanctissima Trinitate.* Authore Josepho Voisin. *Par.* 1647. 8vo.

29. *Soci-*

29. *Socinianiſmi confutati.* Tomus 1. Authore Johanne Hoornebecke Profeſſore Ultrajectano. *Ultrajecti.* 1650. 4to.

30. *Hydra Socinianiſmi expugnata contra* Joh. Volkelium & Joh. Crellium. per Sam. Mareſium, *Groningæ.* 1651. 4to.

31. Bernardus Paxillus ſcripſit *Monomachian pro defenſione Fidei Trinitatis.* Cracov. 1616. In Bibleoth. Bodl.

32. Joh. Cloppenburg ſcripſit *Vindicias pro Deitate Sp. Sancti,* adverſus Joh. Bidellum Anglum. *Franck.* 1652.

33. Joſuæ Stegmanni *Photinianiſmus, ſeu ſuccincta refutatio errorum Photinianorum, &c.* Rhinthelii. 1623. 8vo.

Alii pene infiniti, Pontificii pariter & Reformati ſeſe Socino oppoſuere, ut paſſim videre eſt. Vide ſis.

Ægidium Hunnium in Articulo de Trinitate.

Polanum in Syntagm. Theol. *l.* 3. *c.* 2. *ad* 11.

Barthol. Terres in 1. part. Aquinatis.

Benedict. Szentkiral. Tranſylvanum contra Georgium Enjedinum.

Hieron. Zanchium de tribus Elohim, &c.

Hannib. Roſſeli Comment. in Pæmandrum Hermetis.

Calvinum in defenſione Orthodoxæ fidei ſacræ Trinitatis contra M. Servetum, & Georg. Blandr.

Eraſmum Brochmannum, qui utraq; Controverſiarum parte quæſtiones Socinianas proponit & diſcutit.

Dionyſium Petavium, qui fusè pariter & doctè in Dogmatis Theologicis tractandis contra Socinum diſputat, teſtimoniis ex intimâ Antiquitate petitis.

Tandem longum Scriptorum Catalogum (eorum nempè qui contra Socinum & ſui ſequaces militant) tibi exhibet Chriſtianus Becmannus Bornenſis in Exercitationibus Theologicis Amſtelodami editis An. 1643. pag. 12. Ubi Authores 56 plus minus enumerat, qui juſto Bello & Marte internecino contra Socinum, ipſumq; etiam Socinianiſmum animosè militant. Qui vellet, videat.

Schola-

Scholaſtici (quod ad Articulum Trinitatis attinet) in 1. Sent. P. Lombardi diſtinct. 2. & in 1. parte Aquinatis multa diſputant, curioſa magis fateor quam viro cordato profutura. Quorum omnium Catalogum laboriosè contextum tibi exhibet Johan. Martinez de Ripaldâ in Lib. Sent. 1. Diſp. 2.

FINIS.

Advertiſement.

A Daily Office for the Sick: Compil'd out of the Holy Scripture, and the Liturgy of our Church. With occaſional *Prayers*, *Meditations* and *Directions*.

The *Pantheon*, Repreſenting the fabulous Hiſtories of the Heathen Gods, and moſt Illuſtrious Heroes; in a ſhort, plain and familiar Method, by way of Dialogue, for the Uſe of Schools. Written by *Fra. Pomey*, of the Society of Jeſus: Author of the *French* and *Latin* Dictionary, for the Uſe of the *Dauphin*.

Both Printed for *R. Clavell* at the Peacock in St. *Paul*'s Church-yard.